

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/731,876	KOFFLER, ADAM J.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rodney B. White	3636	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Rodney B. White. (3) _____

(2) Richard A. Schwartz (#48,105). (4) _____

Date of Interview: 03 November 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 26, and 50.


Identification of prior art discussed: Lampel (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,830 B2), Harding et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,142,573, and Snyder et al (U.S. Patent No. 4,522,447).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



RODNEY B. WHITE
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the fact that the last paragraph added to the independent Claims 1, 26, and 50 sounded similar to a method of making claims. While the language does sound like a method of making, the language is essential in defining the claims over the prior art, since the prior art is formed by taking several pieces of pre-shaped foam and securing them together with the use of adhesives or placing one kind of foam into a pre-shaped mold but without using foams of varying densities or modules of elasticity or heating the foam after it was placed in the mold in a gel form. It was agreed that the word "seat" should be added after the word "multi-composition" so that it is clear that it is a "seat" that is being defined and make the added language read more like tht of an article claim instead of a method or process of making. The proposed Examiner's Amendment was agreed upon and entered as such.